

# Semi-leptonic Octet Baryon Weak Axial-Vector Form Factors in the Chiral Constituent Quark Model

Harleen Dahiya<sup>a</sup>, Neetika Sharma<sup>a</sup>, P.K. Chatley<sup>a</sup> and Manmohan Gupta<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Physics, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology,  
Jalandhar, Punjab-144 011, India.*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Physics, Centre of Advanced Study in Physics,  
Panjab University, Chandigarh-160 014, India.*

December 19, 2008

## Abstract

The weak vector and axial-vector form factors have been investigated for the semi-leptonic octet baryon decays in the chiral constituent quark model with configuration mixing ( $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$ ). The effects of SU(3) symmetry breaking and configuration mixing have also been investigated and the results are not only in good agreement with existing experimental data but also show improvement over other phenomenological models.

The measurements of the polarized struture functions in the deep inelastic scattering (DIS) experiments indicate that the valence quarks of the proton carry only about 30% of its spin and also establishes the asymmetry of the quark distribution functions [1]. This is referred to as the “proton spin problem” and it relates the DIS measurements to the weak vector and axial-vector form factors ( $f_{i=1,2,3}(Q^2)$  and  $g_{i=1,2,3}(Q^2)$ ) of the semi-leptonic baryon decays [2]. The data to study the form factors in the early eighties was analyzed under the assumptions of exact SU(3) symmetry [3]. However, the experiments performed recently [4] are more precise and indicate that SU(3) symmetry breaking effects are important. The broader question of SU(3) symmetry breaking has been recently discussed by several authors in various phenomenological models [5] however, the results of all these models are not in agreement with each other on the magnitude as well as sign of these form factors. Pending further experiments, it is of interest to estimate the role of SU(3) symmetry breaking in the weak form factors.

Chiral constituent quark model with configuration ( $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$ ) [6, 7, 8] can yield an adequate description of the “quark sea” generation through the chiral fluctuations and has been successful in explaining various general features of the quark flavor and spin distribution functions and baryon magnetic moments. It, therefore, becomes desirable to carry out a detailed phenomenological analysis within the framework of  $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$  to

calculate the axial-vector form factors [9]. The purpose of the present communication is to carry out a detailed analysis of the weak vector and axial-vector form factors at low energies for the baryon semi-leptonic decays within the framework of  $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$  and to understand the role of SU(3) symmetry breaking and constituent quark masses.

In the  $\chi\text{CQM}$  formalism [7], the fluctuation process is  $q^\pm \rightarrow \text{GB} + q'^\mp \rightarrow (q\bar{q}') + q'^\mp$ , where GB represents the Goldstone boson and  $q\bar{q}' + q'$  constitute the “quark sea”. The effective Lagrangian describing interaction between quarks and a nonet of GBs can be expressed as  $\mathcal{L} = g_8 \bar{\mathbf{q}}(\Phi) \mathbf{q}$ , where  $g_8$  is the coupling constants and  $\Phi$  is the GB field. The SU(3) symmetry breaking is introduced by considering  $m_s > m_{u,d}$  as well as by considering the masses of GBs to be nondegenerate ( $M_{K,\eta} > M_\pi$ ). The nucleon wavefunction with configuration mixing can be expressed as  $|B\rangle = \cos\phi|56, 0^+\rangle_{N=0} + \sin\phi|70, 0^+\rangle_{N=2}$ , where  $\phi$  represents the mixing angle. The spin structure of a nucleon is defined as  $\hat{B} \equiv \langle B|N|B\rangle$  [7], where  $N$  is the number operator  $N = n_{u+}u^+ + n_{u-}u^- + n_{d+}d^+ + n_{d-}d^- + n_{s+}s^+ + n_{s-}s^-$ ,  $n_{q^\pm}$  being the number of  $q^\pm$  quarks.

The transition matrix element for the semi-leptonic hadronic decay process  $B_i \rightarrow B_f + l + \bar{\nu}_l$  is given as  $M = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}(V_{q_i q_f})\langle B_f|J_h^\mu|B_i\rangle(\bar{u}_l(p_l)\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)u_\nu(p_\nu))$ . The weak hadronic current can be expressed in terms of the vector and axial-vector current as  $\langle B_f(p_f)|J_h^\mu|B_i(p_i)\rangle = \langle B_f(p_f)|J_V^\mu - J_A^\mu|B_i(p_i)\rangle$  and the respective matrix elements for the vector and axial-vector current are given as

$$\bar{u}_f(p_f) \left( f_1(Q^2)\gamma^\mu - i\frac{f_2(Q^2)}{M_i + M_f}\sigma^{\mu\nu}q_\nu + \frac{f_3(Q^2)}{M_i + M_f}q^\nu \right) u_i(p_i), \quad (1)$$

$$\bar{u}_f(p_f) \left( g_1(Q^2)\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 - i\frac{g_2(Q^2)}{M_i + M_f}\sigma^{\mu\nu}q_\nu\gamma^5 + \frac{g_3(Q^2)}{M_i + M_f}q^\nu\gamma^5 \right) u_i(p_i), \quad (2)$$

where  $M_i$  ( $M_f$ ) and  $u_i(p_i)$  ( $\bar{u}_f(p_f)$ ) are the masses and Dirac spinors of the initial (final) baryon states, respectively. The four momenta transfer is given as  $Q^2 = -q^2$ , where  $q \equiv p_i - p_f$ . The functions  $f_i(Q^2)$  and  $g_i(Q^2)$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) are the dimensionless vector and axial-vector form factors required to be real by  $G$ -parity. These equations can be solved using Gordon equality, in the Breit-frame (Lorentz frame), where  $\mathbf{p}_i = -\mathbf{p}_f = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{q}$  in the nonrelativistic limit ( $\mathbf{q}^2 \ll M_i^2, M_f^2$ ), giving the vector and axial-vector form factors in terms of the Sachs form factors at  $Q^2 \approx 0$ .

Further, the linear part of form factors can be solved in the quark sector and the form factors for the quark currents can be used to obtain the corresponding vector and axial-vector form factors for the baryons which are expressed as

$$f_1 = f_1(0), \quad f_2 = \left( \frac{\Sigma M}{\Sigma m} \frac{G_A}{G_V} - 1 \right) f_1(0), \quad f_3 = \frac{\Sigma M}{\Sigma m} \left( E \frac{G_A}{G_V} - \epsilon \right) f_1(0), \quad (3)$$

$$g_1 = g_1(0), \quad g_2 = \left( \frac{\Sigma M}{\Sigma m} \epsilon - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Sigma M^2}{\Sigma m^2} \right) E \right) g_1(0), \quad g_3 = \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Sigma M^2}{\Sigma m^2} \right) + \frac{\Sigma M^2}{\Sigma m^2} g_3^q \right) g_1(0), \quad (4)$$

where the higher order terms involving  $E \equiv \frac{\Delta M}{\Sigma M}$  and  $\epsilon \equiv \frac{\Delta m}{\Sigma m}$  have been neglected. The ratio of  $g_1$  and  $f_1$  is the non-singlet combination of the quark spin polarizations given as

$\Delta_3 = \frac{G_A}{G_V} = \frac{g_1(0)}{f_1(0)}$ . The hyperon decays considered in the present work are  $n \rightarrow p$ ,  $\Sigma^\pm \rightarrow \Lambda$ ,  $\Sigma^- \rightarrow \Sigma^0$  and  $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Xi^0$  corresponding to the strangeness conserving decays and  $\Sigma^- \rightarrow n$ ,  $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Sigma^0$ ,  $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Lambda$ ,  $\Lambda \rightarrow p$  and  $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+$  corresponding to the strangeness changing decays.

The  $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$  involves five parameters, four of these  $a$ ,  $a\alpha^2$ ,  $a\beta^2$ ,  $a\zeta^2$  representing respectively the probabilities of fluctuations to pions,  $K$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$ , following the hierarchy  $a > \alpha > \beta > \zeta$ , while the fifth representing the mixing angle. The mixing angle  $\phi$  is fixed from the consideration of neutron charge radius, whereas the other parameters have been fitted using  $\Delta u$ ,  $\Delta_3$  [10] as well as  $\bar{u} - \bar{d}$ ,  $\bar{u}/\bar{d}$  [1] leading to  $a = 0.12$ ,  $\zeta = -0.15$ ,  $\alpha = \beta = 0.45$  as the best fit values.

In Table 1, we have given the individual values of vector and axial-vector form factors in the  $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$ . Some important conclusions can be drawn regarding the dependence of these form factors on configuration mixing and SU(3) symmetry breaking. The ratio  $\frac{g_1}{f_1}$  ratio depends on configuration mixing as well as SU(3) symmetry breaking. The other form factors  $f_2$ ,  $f_3$ ,  $g_2$  and  $g_3$  are found to be dependent on the constituent quark masses only. It can be clearly seen from the results that the contributions of second class currents  $f_3$  and  $g_2$  are very small for the same isospin multiplets. This is because of the small mass difference between the initial and final decay particles.

In Table 2, we have presented the values of  $\frac{g_1}{f_1} = \frac{G_A}{G_V}$  at  $Q^2 = 0$ . The  $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$  is able to give a fairly good account for most of the decays where the experimental data is available for example, in the case of  $\frac{G_A}{G_V}^{\Sigma^- \rightarrow n}$ ,  $\frac{G_A}{G_V}^{\Xi^- \rightarrow \Lambda}$ ,  $\frac{G_A}{G_V}^{\Lambda \rightarrow p}$  and  $\frac{G_A}{G_V}^{\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+}$ . The SU(3) symmetry breaking as well as configuration mixing effects have been incorporated in the calculations and it clearly leads to a better agreement with data. Therefore, both are simultaneously important to obtain the desired agreement. A refinement in the case of the measurements with the assumption of SU(3) symmetry breaking would have important implications for the basic tenets of  $\chi\text{CQM}$  as well as SU(3) symmetry breaking.

In conclusion, we would like to state that at the leading order constituent quarks and the weakly interacting Goldstone bosons constitute the appropriate degrees of freedom in the nonperturbative regime of QCD in the  $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$  and SU(3) symmetry breaking is the key in understanding the spin content and the weak axial-vector form factors of the semi-leptonic octet baryon decays.

## References

- [1] European Muon Collaboration, J. Ashman *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B 328**, 1 (1989); E866/NuSea Collaboration, R. S. Towell *et al.*, *ibid.* **64**, 052002 (2001).
- [2] Lepton and Quarks, L.B. Okun, Elsevier Science Publishers (1984); F.E. Close, *The Nucleon Spin Crisis Bible*, RAL-93-034, 1993 (unpublished); F.E. Close and R.G. Roberts, Phys. Lett. B **316**, 165 (1993).
- [3] M. Bourquin *et al.*, Z. Phys. **21**, 17 (1983); *ibid* **21**, 27 (1983).

| Decay                                         | $f_1$  | $f_2$  | $f_3$  | $g_1$  | $g_2$  | $g_3$  |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| $n \rightarrow pe^- \bar{\nu}$                | 1.00   | 2.612  | 0.003  | 1.270  | -0.004 | -232.9 |
| $\Sigma^- \rightarrow \Sigma^0 e^- \bar{\nu}$ | 1.414  | 1.033  | 0.005  | 0.676  | -0.010 | -201.3 |
| $\Sigma^- \rightarrow \Lambda e^- \bar{\nu}$  | 0      | 2.265  | 0.080  | 0.646  | -0.152 | -271.4 |
| $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow \Lambda e^- \bar{\nu}$  | 0      | 2.257  | 0.072  | 0.646  | -0.136 | -245.9 |
| $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Xi^0 e^- \bar{\nu}$       | -1.00  | 2.253  | 0.003  | 0.314  | -0.007 | 113.8  |
| $\Sigma^- \rightarrow ne^- \bar{\nu}$         | -1.0   | 1.813  | 0.616  | 0.314  | 0.017  | -9.2   |
| $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Sigma^0 e^- \bar{\nu}$    | 0.707  | 2.029  | -0.291 | 0.898  | 0.310  | -29.1  |
| $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Lambda e^- \bar{\nu}$     | 1.225  | -0.450 | -0.658 | 0.262  | 0.047  | -8.9   |
| $\Lambda \rightarrow pe^- \bar{\nu}$          | -1.225 | -1.037 | 0.415  | -0.909 | -0.170 | 20.7   |
| $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ e^- \bar{\nu}$    | 1.0    | 2.854  | -0.414 | 1.27   | 0.446  | -40.7  |

Table 1: Weak vector and axial-vector form factors for the semi-leptonic octet baryons decays in the  $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$ .

- [4] S.Y. Hsueh *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D 38**, 2056 (1988); A. Alavi-Harati *et al.*, KTeV Collab., Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 132001 (2001); J.R. Batley *et al* [NA48/1 Collabotrati] Phys. Lett. **B 645**, 36 (2007).
- [5] V. Mateu, A. Pich, JHEP **0510**, 041 (2005); R. Flores-Mendieta and C.P. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. **D 74**, 094001 (2006); A. Lacour, B. Kubis and U.G. Meissner, JHEP **0710**, 083 (2007); T. Ledwig, A. Silva, H.-Ch. Kim, K. Goeke, JHEP **0807**, 132 (2008)
- [6] S. Weinberg, Physica **A 96**, 327 (1979); A. Manohar and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. **B 234**, 189 (1984).
- [7] E.J. Eichten, I. Hinchliffe and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. **D 45**, 2269 (1992); T.P. Cheng and Ling Fong Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2789 (1998); J. Linde, T. Ohlsson and H. Snellman, Phys. Rev. **D 57**, 452 (1998).
- [8] H. Dahiya and M. Gupta, Phys. Rev. **D 64**, 014013 (2001); *ibid.* **D 67**, 074001 (2003); *ibid.* Phys. Rev. **D 66**, 051501(R) (2002), *ibid.* **67**, 114015 (2003).
- [9] T. Ohlsson and H. Snellman, Eur. Phys. J. **C 6**, 285 (1999); *ibid.* **7**, 501 (1999); *ibid.* **C 12**, 271 (2000).
- [10] C. Amsler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 667**, 1 (2008).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

H.D. would like to thank CCSTDS, Government of India and the organizers of SPIN2008, University of Virginia, for financial support.

| Decay                                           | Data<br>[10]                     | NQM   | $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$<br>with SU(3)<br>symmetry | $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$ with<br>SU(3) symmetry<br>breaking |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} n \rightarrow p$               | $1.2695 \pm 0.0029$              | 1.67  | 0.95                                                       | 1.27                                                                |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Sigma^- \rightarrow \Sigma^0$ | —                                | 0.67  | 0.39                                                       | 0.48                                                                |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Sigma^- \rightarrow \Lambda$  | $\frac{f_1}{g_1} = 0.01 \pm 0.1$ | 0.82  | 0.45                                                       | 0.65                                                                |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Sigma^+ \rightarrow \Lambda$  | —                                | 0.82  | 0.45                                                       | 0.65                                                                |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Xi^- \rightarrow \Xi^0$       | —                                | −0.33 | −0.16                                                      | −0.31                                                               |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Sigma^- \rightarrow n$        | $-0.340 \pm 0.017$               | −0.33 | −0.16                                                      | −0.31                                                               |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Xi^- \rightarrow \Sigma^0$    | —                                | 1.67  | 0.95                                                       | 1.27                                                                |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Xi^- \rightarrow \Lambda$     | $0.25 \pm 0.05$                  | 0.33  | 0.21                                                       | 0.21                                                                |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Lambda \rightarrow p$         | $0.718 \pm 0.015$                | 1.00  | 0.58                                                       | 0.74                                                                |
| $\frac{G_A}{G_V} \Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+$    | $1.21 \pm 0.05$                  | 1.67  | 0.95                                                       | 1.27                                                                |

Table 2: Predictions for the the axial-vector form factors  $G_A/G_V$  in  $\chi\text{CQM}_{\text{config}}$ .